

REMARKS

Claims 5-12 and 14-38 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 17, 19, 20, 24 and 35-38 have been amended to more particularly define the invention. Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 2 and 5-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freedman (U.S. Patent No. 4,839,829) in view of Mandler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,400; hereinafter "Mandler") and further in view of Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,279).

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention, of exemplary claim 36, provides a printing pictures production system wherein the identification information is given to the customer in exchange for receiving the image data, and wherein the image data storing unit instructs the first terminal to display the image data by an input of the identification information from the first terminal (see e.g., Application at page 5, lines 5-9). This allows the claimed invention to provide a printing pictures production system capable of preventing monetary damages to shops due to customers failing to pay for services (see Application at page 2, lines 7-27).

II. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

The Examiner alleges that Ishii and Mandler would have been combined with Freemand to teach the claimed invention of claims 2 and 5-38. Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged combination of references does not teach or suggest (nor make obvious) each

and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Freedman nor Mandler nor Ishii, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*wherein said identification information is given to the customer in exchange for receiving the image data, and wherein said image data storing unit instructs said first terminal to display the image data by an input of said identification information from said first terminal*”, as recited in claims 17, 19, 20, 24 and 35-38.

In “a production system” of the present invention, a first terminal (e.g., 20; please note that reference numbers are merely provided for the convenience of the Examiner and are not meant to limit the subject matter of the claimed invention in any manner) gives a customer “the identification information” in exchange for receiving the image data (e.g., see Application at page 5, lines 5-9). Additionally, the second terminal (e.g., 40) has an access right to authenticate order information to at least either the image data storing unit (e.g., 110) or the order information storing unit (e.g., 100) (e.g., see Application at page 11, lines 26-28 and page 19, lines 15-18). When identification information is re-input to the second terminal (e.g., 40), the order information input to the first terminal (e.g., 20) is authenticated as a correct order. Consequently, even if the first terminal (e.g., 20) is placed beyond the view of the shop clerk (e.g., 18), the reception of false orders can be prevented since those who have input an order have to come in front of the shop clerk (e.g., 18) (e.g., see Application at page 12, lines 3-6).

In stark contrast, Freeman fails to teach or suggest the above feature of the present invention. Accordingly, the “automatic printing control system” of Freeman cannot accomplish the same advantage as that of the “production system” of the present invention.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Mandler and Ishii fail to make up the deficiencies of Freeman. Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Mandler or Ishii teaches or

suggests a printing pictures production system wherein the identification information is given to the customer in exchange for receiving the image data, and wherein the image data storing unit instructs the first terminal to display the image data by an input of the identification information from the first terminal.

Therefore, Applicants submit the alleged combination of references does not teach or suggest (nor make obvious) each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 5-12 and 14-38, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.


Serial No. 09/769,382
Docket No. FF-0126US

22

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: April 24, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254